CHAPTER III.

An introduction to the confutation of the Atheistic grounds, in which is contained a particular account of all the several forms of Atheism. —1. That the grounds of the Hylozoic Atheism could not be insisted on in the former chapter, together with those of the Atomic, they being' directly contrary each to other; with a further account ^of this Hylozoic Atheism.—2. A suggestion, by way of caution, for the preventing of all mistakes, that every Hylozoist must not therefore be condemned for an Atheist, or a mere counterfeit his-trionical Theist.—3. That, nevertheless, such Hylozoists as arc also Corporealists, can by no means be excused from the imputation of Atheism, for two reasons.—4. That Strato Lampsacemis, commonly called Physicus, seems to have been the first assertor of the Hylozoic Atheism, he holding no other God but the life of nature in matter.—5. Further proved, that Strato was an Atheist, and that of a different form from Democritus, 'lie attributing an energetic nature, but without sense and animality, to all matter.—6. That. Strato, not deriving all things from a mere fortuitous principle, as the Democritic Atheists did, nor yet acknowledging any one plastic nature to preside over the whole, but deducing the original of things from a mixture of chance and plastic nature both together in the several parts of matter, must therefore needs be an Hylozoic Atheist. —7. That the famous Hippocrates was neither an Hylozoic nor Democritic Atheist, but rather an Heraclitic corporeal Theist.—8. That Plato took no notice of the Hylozoic Atheism, nor of any other than what derives the original of all things from a mere fortuitous nature; and, therefore, either the Democritical or the Anaximan-drian Atheism, which latter will be next declared.—9. That it is hardly imaginable, there should have been no philosophic Atheists in the .world before Democritus and Leucippus, there being in all ages, as Plato observes, some or other sick of the Atheistic disease. That Aristotle affirms many of the first philosophers to have assigned only a material cause of the mundane system, without either efficient or intending cause; they supposing matter to be the only substance, and all things else nothing but the passions and accidents

' of it, generable and corruptible.—10. That the doctrine of these Materialists will be more fully understood from the exceptions which Aristotle makes against them: his first exception, that they assigned no cause of motion, but introduced, it into the world unaccountably.—11. Aristotle's second exception, that these Materialists did assign no cause *?& iv xti **>&<;,* of well and fit, and give no account